

Williams & Smith, actually begins 'If the type designated for a new nominal genus. . .'. In this case Stejneger did not designate the type species for a new genus but for a previously established one. As written, Article 70b does not cover type species designations for previously established nominal genera, nor in my view was it intended to.

In his comment Sabrosky wrote 'Daudin's *bullaris* was not a misidentification but a mixture of true *bullaris* and other forms now known to be distinct species. It cannot therefore be interpreted as a misidentified type species situation. . .'. I had earlier accepted this argument but, on reflection, I believe I was wrong to do so. It is true that Daudin's concept of the species included true *bullaris* inasmuch as he believed his material and Linnaeus' *bullaris* (i.e. Catesby's plate 66) to be conspecific. But the same must surely be true of any case of misidentified type species. An author would hardly use a name if he did not consider the type material of that species and his own material to belong to the same species. To accept Sabrosky's argument would be tantamount to accepting that there is no such thing as a misidentified type species.

I now believe that the misidentification referred to in Article 70a must be of the material actually before the author regardless of any cited references to material not seen by him. While it is clear that Daudin's material of *bullaris* comprised more than one species it is equally clear that it did not include any true *bullaris* Linnaeus. As indicated by Williams & Smith, the material seen by Daudin included at least one specimen collected 'en Caroline' by Bosc. There seems little doubt that *bullaris* of Daudin was based in part on the species now known as *Anolis carolinensis* Voigt.

I now agree with Williams & Smith that *Anolis bullaris* as used by Daudin, 1802 is a misidentified type species in the sense of Article 70a and that the plenary powers should be used to designate as type species of the genus *Anolis* Daudin a species actually before the author, namely *Anolis carolinensis* Voigt, 1832. I thus fully support the proposals contained in the original petition of Smith, Williams & Lazell, 1963.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS
TO SUPPRESS THE HOLOTYPE AND TO DESIGNATE A NEOTYPE
FOR *GALAGO CRASSICAUDATUS* E. GEOFFROY, 1812 (PRIMATES,
GALAGIDAE). Z.N.(S.) 2285
(see vol. 37, pp. 176-185)

By W. F. H. Ansell (Trendrine, Zennor, St Ives, Cornwall, United Kingdom)

It is surely desirable to retain the familiar and long standing specific name *crassicaudatus* and to be able to associate the nominate form with a definite locality. The type locality Quelimane, as designated by Thomas (1917, p. 48), does not do this because it lies within the zone of hybridisation between subspecies *monteiri* and the next properly distinguishable subspecies, which occupies the southern part of the species range. Dr Olson has, moreover, shown that Thomas was mistaken in supposing that Peters (1852, p. 292) was the first to identify the species with a definite locality because Sundevall had earlier (in van der Hoeven, 1844, p. 42) reported a specimen from 'near Port Natal in

Caffraria', i.e. near Durban, Natal. It therefore seems perfectly justifiable to set aside the type locality designated by Thomas. The neotype proposed by Olson is from a definite locality which is both within the range of the recognisably distinct southern subspecies and near enough to where Sundevall's specimen originated. It would fulfil the purpose of stabilising the nomenclature of the species. I therefore support both of Dr Olson's proposals.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE
SPECIES FOR *INDODORYLAIMUS* ALI & PRABHA, 1974
(NEMATODA, DORYLAIMIDA) Z.N.(S.) 2335
(see vol. 39, pp. 57–58; vol. 39, p. 285)

(1) By M. R. Siddiqi (*Commonwealth Institute of Parasitology, Herts, U.K.*)

The application of Qaiser Baqri as published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, p. 285, states that he has designated a lectotype from the available syntypes, and I feel that the use of plenary powers to support this action is not called for. Article 74a of the International Code clearly provides for such an action of designating a syntype as lectotype and Baqri's action is justified.

With regard to the proposal to designate a type species for *Indodorylaimus* Ali & Prabha, 1974 (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 57–58), I strongly believe that *Thornenema wickeni* Yeates, 1970, a well documented species, is the type species of the genus *Indodorylaimus* Ali & Prabha, 1974, for the following three reasons:

1. *Indodorylaimus* n.gen. was proposed by Ali & Prabha, 1974 (*Nematologica* vol. 19, for 1973, p. 486) who fixed its type species thus:

Type species: *Indodorylaimus wickeni* (Yeates, 1970)

n.comb. (syn. *Thornenema wickeni* Yeates, 1970). *Thornenema wickeni* Yeates, 1970 is thus the original designation of the type species for *Indodorylaimus*, and is the type species regardless of other considerations (Art. 68a).

2. The reason for the creation of a new genus *Indodorylaimus* is given by the authors just before the generic diagnosis as follows:

'Yeates (1970) described *Thornenema wickeni* based on females. The female specimens described herein agree with his description in all essential measurements and in body characters. However the males of this species, reported herein for the first time, have a tail similar to that of the female necessitating removal of this species from *Thornenema* in which the tails of the sexes are dissimilar (elongate-filiform in females and short, bluntly conoid in males). Therefore a new genus *Indodorylaimus* is proposed for its inclusion under *Prodorylaimidae*.'

This clearly shows that the authors discussed the taxonomy of *Thornenema wickeni* Yeates and proposed a genus for its reception. (Note 'its inclusion' in the last sentence).

3. Ali & Prabha (1974) differentiated their new genus *Indodorylaimus* thus:

'*Indodorylaimus* is close to *Sicaguttur* from which it differs in having a mono-opisthodelphic gonad in the female and the first ventromedian supplement within the range of spicules in the male.'